

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Submitted herewith are two (2) replacement sheets of drawings.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 now stand in the application, claims 8 and 9 having been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The specification and drawings have been amended to address the issues raised by the examiner in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office action.

The claims have been editorially amended for consistency to address the antecedent basis issue raised by the examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office action.

The prior art rejections are respectfully traversed.

The examiner again relies on Osborn to teach a reflecting concentrator. It does not. The Fresnel lens in Osborn is not a reflecting concentrator. This has been explained to the examiner. The examiner now cites Matsushita as evidence that the Fresnel lens in Osborn is a reflecting concentrator. But the very figure relied on in Matsushita to allegedly show a reflecting concentrator shows the incident light passing through the Fresnel lens and being refracted, not reflected. The fact that the examiner can find one patent from amongst millions that happens to carelessly use the word “reflects” when it should have said “refracts” does not support a conclusion that the Fresnel lens is somehow functioning in a manner contrary to the manner in which everyone of skill in the art knows a Fresnel lens to operate.

In any event, claim 1 has now been amended to recite that the reflecting concentrator has a reflecting surface and to also recite that the filter is situated such that light must pass through the filter to reach the reflecting surface and must again pass through the filter to be directed toward the photoelectric cell. This clarifies how the reflecting concentrator and filter cooperate with one another.

There is no obvious combination of the teachings of the applied art which will result in a filter layer through which light passes both before and after reflection by the reflecting surface of the concentrator.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 2, 2008

/DJCushing/  
David J. Cushing  
Registration No. 28,703